MEMORANDUM FOR:

Director, Office of Flanning, Programming and

Budgeting

SUBJECT:

Evaluation Systems

REFERENCES:

Memo dated 18 January 1973 to Comptroller/DDS&T from O/PPB, same subject (PPB-73-0082)

Concept Paper dated 9 January 1973 from O/PPB,

same subject (PS/OPPB)

Memo dated 20 September 1972 to Inspector General from A/DD/S&T, subject: Evaluation and

Productivity (

25X1

d. Memo dated 25 May 1970 to Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies from the President (including ExDir-Compt routing slip) (ER-70-2744)

- 1. This Directorate is in accord with the basic objectives of subject program. The program as outlined in the concept paper and the draft implement paper appears to have some inherent weaknesses, however, to which we will address some specific comments.
- 2. Generally speaking, we feel we are employing well-organized and effective evaluation procedures at the present time. We detailed these procedures to the Inspector General in our memorandum of 20 September 1972 (referenced above). A copy of this memorandum is or can be available in O/PPB. We believe our current procedures are consonant with the intent of the President's memorandum of 25 May 1970. To take the giant leap forward, suggested by the O/PPB papers, would not only be vastly costly but we question the potential value of the product which might be obtained. There is a marked degree of complexity and redundancy built into the system as outlined. Lower echelon reporting would be reiterated in an expanded manner in the evaluation of objectives at each succeeding higher

25X1

ှ Approved For Release 2004/01/14 ትርሀብ-RDP76B00734R000100050036-7

-2-

SUBJECT: Evaluation Systems

level of reporting. It would be complicated from our standpoint because of the myriad of benchmarks, milestones, checkpoints, etc., that exist at the operating level in our offices. Furthermore, we feel management support activities do not lend themselves to formal systematic evaluation. Since all Agency employees are evaluated annually by the Fitness Report program, it seems redundant to re-evaluate them singularly or as a group in this system. When individual efforts are pooled into a staff function, the manager who supervises their efforts must make an evaluation of the worth of their efforts; but it is usually an "adequate/inadequate" type of evaluation. Our Deputy Director and all of our office directors took exception to listing Priority and Performance indices for their management support activities in last year's Program. Their protestations would be magnified if they were asked to attach a narrative to what they consider a meaningless indicator.

- 3. Also, of a general nature, the instructions as outlined in your papers appear to be too vague and incomplete for the purpose to which they are intended. Firm, concise, complete instructions would seem in order for a program of this magnitude.
- 4. Our specific comments on the concept paper and the implementation procedures are as follows:

a. Concept Paper

- (1) Assumptions (Pages 1 and 2) Para 3 and 4. The third assumption on the diversity of Agency objectives and the impossibility of a uniform system of evaluation is exactly correct. To develop, maintain, and operate the multiplex system that will be necessary to incorporate all aspects of our operation will result in a cumbersome workload (much of it redundant). Some of our offices will find this added tasking impossible to handle within their current, austere ceilings. A request for additional positions would, in all probability, be futile. Additionally, an added workload would occur at the operating level and would accrue to the very people who are currently overworked.
- (2) <u>Assumptions</u> (<u>Page 2</u>) <u>Para 5</u>. We feel this Directorate is already doing an adequate job in this area (see para 2 above). We also question the detail which this program requires. We prefer that evaluation remain at the Division or Office level (as is currently being done), and that we not be required to include every position and every dollar.

Approved For Release 2004/01/43-: CIA-RDP76B00734R000100050036-7

SUBJECT: Evaluation Systems

- (3) General (Page 2) Para 1. The titles used for the categories of evaluation appear misleading. Basically, program effectiveness is a result of product (or service) quality and efficiency. You can't have one without the others. When we examine the semantics in which the O/PPB paper couches these terms, the meanings become clear, but better terminology might be possible.
- (4) General (Page 3) last paragraph. We trust "Performance Evaluation deriving from various review processes" will be required for the FY 1975 Program only for systems currently in being. The proposed Evaluation System is not well enough developed to permit formulation and utilization of new criteria prior to the 30 April 1973 deadline.
- (5) Measurements and Objectives (Page 3) Para 1. This instruction would result in an immense list of objectives. OSP, for example, operates on a "milestone" basis and they have a multitude of same to guide their existing programs. Other offices vary in the way they break out their objectives, but the accumulated total for the DD/S&T almost certainly will run into the hundreds.
- (6) Measurement and Objectives (Page 4) last paragraph. Our previous remark (para 2 above) on the suitability of management support items for this system applies here. We fail to see what "benchmarks", or other measuring criteria we could use for non-project activities.
- (7) Responsibilities and Procedures (Page 4) Para 1. Much of the work done in S&T offices is performed on an "as required" basis, e.g., OCS, OSA/Commo, OEL/Analysis Division, OEL Division, etc. Their objective is to satisfy the Agency requirements for their services. If they accomplish this goal, they have performed in a satisfactory manner; if not, they have failed. Graduated evaluation, under these circumstances, is irrelevant.

25X1

b. Implementation Procedure

(1) The timing on this program is of importance to us. We would prefer (as previously stated) to forestall any implementation of the system until after the Program has been submitted (30 April 1973).

.

് -Approved For Release 200≰/0ქ/ქ4ը ⊊IAըRDP76B00734R000100050036-7

SUBJECT: Evaluation Systems

(2) We assume that this will be a continuing program, but the O/PPB paper neglects to build in the "feedback" step whereby this system would be perpetuated.

7.	These	are	our	views	of	the	moment.		
									25X ²
							Comptroller	_	•
					g _o		rectorate of		

`Approved For Release 2004/01/14 : CIA-RDP76B00734R000100050036-7

SECRET

-5-

25X1 P&P Br/Compt/DD/S&T/ Distribution:

Orig - Addee 1 - Compt

1 - P&P Br

2 - DD/S&T Reg